

Miss Ashley regrets our restriction of the invalidity pension to those earning nothing instead of, as in Germany, to those earning less than one-third of their average wages, as likely to encourage malingering; and would prefer no maternity benefit for wives of insured men unless themselves insured. It is still too early to test the effect of Bismarck's legislation upon national health; but the compulsory system provides valuable information as to the course and causes of disease. The contributory principle is much commended, but Miss Ashley thinks the pauperisation argument is sometimes overdone. "Too much danger of misfortune in life is weakening rather than strengthening"—surely a sound reflection for the sterner type of eugenic politician.

A. W. COCKBURN.

Engel, DR. *The Elements of Child-Protection*. Translated by Dr. Eden Paul. London. Geo. Allen and Co.; 1912; price 15s.; pp. 276.

A VERY disappointing book. The first part consists of a sketchy enumeration of the various conditions that militate against the physical and moral well-being of the child. This is followed by a vague account of the various agencies which are at work for the benefit of the child. But Dr. Engel does not give us a single illuminating idea on the problems involved, and we have looked in vain for the data which, in his preface, he claims to have supplied us in order to enable us to form our own conclusions. He gives us simply page after page of statements without either the facts on which he bases them, or the reasons which have guided him in making them. These statements, he seems to think, are incontrovertible, and the great majority of them doubtless are, being mere platitudes, such as "Artificial feeding (of infants) frequently leads to illness, life-long debility, premature death, etc.," or "Alcoholism is a cause, both direct and indirect, of the maltreatment of children." But what will Eugenists say to "the parental constitution must be regarded as largely dependent upon the social environment in which the parents themselves have grown to maturity," or followers of Karl Pearson to the blind placing, as usual, of women's "*work for wages*" as one of the *chief* causes of infant mortality? Or what can anyone say to such statements, absolutely unsupported by either example or argument, as "Capitalism gives rise to numerous diseases in the social organism, and then endeavours to cure them, *for the most part, by the methods of child-protection*," and "Child-protection to-day is in essence *nothing more than a number of repressive measures*, which are necessary only because capitalism will not permit the desired ends to be obtained by the use of preventive methods, owing to the fact that prevention would involve the destruction of capitalism" (the italics are ours).

It is difficult to understand why this book was thought worthy of translation. It would be a very unsafe guide for those ignorant of the subject, and quite useless for anyone with any knowledge of it.

M. B. ANDREWS.

Saleeby, C. W., M.D., F.R.S.E. *Woman and Womanhood: A Search for Principles*. London. Heinemann; 1912; 10s. net; pp. 398.

WE disagree with Dr. Saleeby concerning many of the details of his book, but recognise that in it the true eugenic aspect of the woman's movement is clearly portrayed, and therefore recommend it for the consideration of all women who are taking part in the movement, and, above all, those who are responsible for its policy. There is very little to be said either for or against the woman's movement that has not been reiterated *ad nauseam*, but while nothing new is said, the facts are so grouped into their racial, social and economic settings as to throw fresh light on many points, and to conduce to clear thinking on some of the fundamental principles.